

A New Method Of Distinguishing Models For The High- Q^2 Events At HERA

Zhen Cao¹, Xiao-Gang He² and Bruce McKellar²

¹*Institute of Theoretical Science, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-5203, USA*

²*School of Physics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Vic. 3052, Australia*

(July, 1997)

Abstract

Many explanations for the excess high- Q^2 $e^+p \rightarrow e^+X$ events from H1 and ZEUS at HERA have been proposed each with criticisms. We propose a new method to distinguish different models by looking at a new distribution which is insensitive to parton distribution function, but sensitive to new physics.

PACS numbers: 13.60.-r, 13.85.Hd, 13.87.-a

The H1 and ZEUS experiments at HERA have observed [1] an excess of events in $e^+p \rightarrow e^+X$ at $Q^2 > 15,000 \text{ GeV}^2$ compared to Standard Model (SM) expectations based on conventional parton distribution functions (PDF). There are several possibilities that might explain the observed anomaly at HERA [1–8]. First, a statistical fluctuation could be responsible although the probability for this is small [1]. A second possibility is that the PDF's at high- Q^2 and large x are not well understood. Some new effects may modify PDF's in the relevant kinematic region [2,3]. And finally, there is the possibility that there are some new physics sources which cause the anomalous events. Many theoretical explanations introducing new physics have been proposed [4–8]. If data from HERA indeed represent a genuine deviation from the SM, it is important to discover some way by which one can distinguish different explanations for the anomalous events using data from HERA.

In all current known investigations, the basic strategy in search for whatever new physics is to look for the direct excess from the prediction of the SM. This, however, sensitively depends on the statistics of the experimental result and on how precisely the SM result is calculated. Unfortunately, the uncertainty of the calculation may be quite large due to our poor knowledge about the PDF's at high- Q^2 and large x . In this paper we will introduce a new measure which is defined as a ratio of the cross section integrated over different angular ranges. The advantage of doing this is that the uncertainty due to parton distributions would be remarkably reduced. This measure would make it possible to distinguish different models with less ambiguity as the statistics of data is improved in the near future.

The cross section for $e^+p \rightarrow e^+X$ is given by

$$\frac{d\sigma(e^+p)}{dxdy} = \frac{sx}{16\pi} \sum_q \{q(x, Q^2)[|M_{LR}^{eq}|^2 + |M_{RL}^{eq}|^2 + (1-y)^2(|M_{LL}^{eq}|^2 + |M_{RR}^{eq}|^2)]\} , \quad (1)$$

where the summation on q is over all valence and sea quarks, Q is the momentum transfer, $x = Q^2/(2P \cdot k)$ and $y = Q^2/sx$ are the Bjorken variables, P is the proton momentum, $k^2 = -Q^2$, s is the CM energy squared, $q(x, Q^2)$ is the q -quark PDF, and

$$M_{ij}^{eq} = -\frac{e^2 Q_e Q_q}{sxy} - \frac{g_Z^2 (T_{ei}^3 - \sin^2 \theta_W Q_e)(T_{qj}^3 - \sin^2 \theta_W Q_q)}{sxy + m_Z^2} + M_{ij}^{eq}(\text{new}) . \quad (2)$$

Here Q_f and T_{fi}^3 are the charges and weak isospins of relevant fermions, respectively, $g_Z = e/(\sin\theta_W \cos\theta_W)$. In the above equation the first two terms in M_{ij} are contributions from the SM and the last term is from possible new physics beyond the SM.

For concreteness, we will consider three representative possibilities for the explanation of the anomaly: 1) Modification of PDF's; 2) New physics due to s-channel production of new particle; And 3) New physics due to contact interactions.

If the anomaly is due to the modification of the PDF's, there is no change in parton level cross section. There are strong constraints on the PDF's from experimental data at low Q^2 . However, in the kinematic region relevant to HERA data the PDF's are not well understood, especially for large x . Modification required to the PDF's may arise from non-perturbative dynamics which produces new effects in the PDF's at low Q^2 and very large $x \sim 1$. This new effect will migrate down to smaller x as one flows up to higher Q^2 due to QCD evolution. Without the detailed understanding of the dynamics, one can not calculate the new contributions, but can try to parameterize possible new contributions and to fit available experimental data. It has been shown in Ref. [2] that by adding to the u-quark PDF a small contribution at low $Q \sim 1.6$ GeV and $x > 0.75$, one can significantly enhance the event rate at large Q^2 and large x . In our later discussion, we will not attempt to fit the new contribution to all other experimental data, instead we will concentrate on the possibility of distinguishing this explanation from others discussed below by using HERA data.

In our numerical analysis we will assume that the new effect produces a rectangular peak in the u-quark PDF at $Q \sim 1.6$ GeV and $x > 0.9$ (the specific shape of the new effect is not important). The size of the peak is determined by fitting the $e^+p \rightarrow e^+X$ data from H1 and ZEUS. In our calculation, the CTEQ4M PDF's are used as conventional ones. We find that the additional term with $0.5 \sim 1\%$ (as mentioned in Ref. [2]) of the conventional valence u-quark PDF at $Q \sim 1.6$ GeV and $x > 0.9$ is not enough to produce the data. At least 4% is required. The effects of modification of the PDF's are shown in Fig.1.

If the anomaly is due to s-channel resonance, a new particle with appropriate mass will

be produced. The new particle may be a leptoquark or a stop with R-parity violation. Assuming the new particle ϕ of mass m_ϕ to be a scalar with coupling to e and q given by $L = \lambda \bar{e}_i q_j \phi$, the change in the cross section is to have a non-zero $M_{ij}^{eq}(new)$ equals to $-|\lambda|^2/(2(xs - m_\phi^2 + i\Gamma m_\phi))$. Here Γ is the total decay width of ϕ .

H1 data indeed suggest a resonance with the excess events clustered at x between 0.4 and 0.5 which translates into the determination of the mass about 200 GeV [1]. If the leptoquark is coupled to e_L and u_R , to explain the anomalous events the parameter λ is determined to be 0.025 [5,6]. The result is shown in Fig.1.

If the anomaly is due to new contact interactions, which may arise from compositeness of quarks or exchange of heavy particles beyond the SM, the new effect will modify the parton level scattering matrix element. The relevant contact interaction is conventionally parameterized as [7]

$$L_{C.T.} = \sum_q [\eta_{LL}^{eq} (\bar{e}_L \gamma_\mu e_L \bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu q_L) + \eta_{RR}^{eq} (\bar{e}_R \gamma_\mu e_R \bar{q}_R \gamma^\mu q_R) + \eta_{LR}^{eq} (\bar{e}_L \gamma_\mu e_L \bar{q}_R \gamma^\mu q_R) + \eta_{RL}^{eq} (\bar{e}_R \gamma_\mu e_R \bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu q_L)] . \quad (3)$$

The change in the cross section is to have a non-zero $M_{ij}^{eq}(new)$ equals to η_{ij}^{eq} .

There are many constraints on allowed values for parameters η_{ij} which limit possible solutions for the anomaly [5–8]. Two types of solutions have been proposed in the literature. They are solutions **A** [7] and **B** [8]:

$$\eta_{LR}^{eu} = \eta_{RL}^{eu} = 1.4 \text{TeV}^{-2} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{RL}^{eu} = -\eta_{RR}^{eu} = 1.9 \text{TeV}^{-2}, \quad (4)$$

respectively and all the other η_{ij} equal to zero. The value for solution **B** is larger than that given in Ref. [8] because d-quark contribution was included according to gauge invariance there. The effects of these two solutions on the production rates are shown in Fig.1 also.

From Fig.1 it is clear to see that all the models discussed above can equally explain the anomaly at HERA if only the production rate is concerned. However it is not possible to distinguish these models from each other. In order to distinguish different models, more information is needed. The obvious way to obtain such information is to study differential

cross section. As have been mentioned previously that the leptoquark production model is featured by a resonance in the x distribution, whereas modification of PDF's and introduction of contact interactions would not produce resonance structure. This can be used to discriminate the leptoquark production from other models.

To further distinguish other models, one must look for some other distributions. The differential distribution in x and y may provide some needed information. In order to avoid the trouble from our poor understanding about the PDF's which strongly influences the shape of this distribution, it would be important to study distributions whose dependence on the PDF's is eliminated, or at least is substantially reduced. To this end we introduce a new measure to distinguish different models.

It is obvious that if one uses the ratio of cross sections in two regions with given x and y , the dependence on PDF's will be greatly reduced. This will not entirely eliminate the PDF's effects because the cross section is summed over different quarks inside the proton. However, if one of the quark contribution dominates over others, the cancellation will be significant. This is true for the cases considered here, for example, the contribution from u-quark in the SM is more than 90% for $Q^2 > 15,000 \text{ GeV}^2$. It, however, would require a tremendous luminosity to have a reasonable statistical significance, if the differential cross section in both x and y is used. A traditional solution to this is to investigate the integrated cross section, say over the variable y . The integration procedure, however, may weaken the cancellation of PDF's. Therefore, the key to this investigation is to find a quantity on which both the PDF's and the cross section do not change dramatically. If these conditions are satisfied, the PDF's can almost be factorized out from the integral of the cross section over such a quantity. Naively, from the first term in M_{ij} , one would think that the dependence of the cross section on $1/y$ is a constant for a fixed x which may be good for our study. Numerically, we find $\psi = 1/y^2$ is more suitable because of the appearance of the additional terms. The cross section as a function of ψ is shown in Fig.2 for fixed x . One finds indeed that the distribution is fairly flat. The new measure we suggest in this paper is defined as

$$R_\psi(x) = \frac{\int_{\psi_{low}}^{\psi_{mid}} (d^2\sigma/dxd\psi) d\psi}{\int_{\psi_{mid}}^{\psi_{up}} (d^2\sigma/dxd\psi) d\psi} . \quad (5)$$

We also note that in the region under consideration the PDF's very weakly depend on the variable ψ . This can be easily seen from Fig.2. Therefore, the cancellation of PDF effects does not sensitively depend on how the integration regions for numerator and denominator are divided in Eqn.5, although the value of R_ψ does. It is clear that $R_\psi(x)$ will be insensitive to the PDF's, but is sensitive to changes in the parton level cross section and therefore to new physics.

Numerically, we used 100, 20 and 1 for ψ_{up} , ψ_{mid} , and ψ_{low} , respectively. As expected, for the SM the ratio is almost flat as x varies from 0.2 to 1. This is shown in Fig.3. Results for different models are also calculated and plotted on the same figure. From the figure we see indeed that changes in PDF's do not alter the distribution very much. As promised that the distribution is sensitive to new physics, the s-channel new particle production and contact interaction models show very different features.

The leptoquark production model produces a distribution very close to the prediction of the SM in almost all the regions of x except in the vicinity where x is close to the resonance. A very high and very sharp peak is predicted corresponding to the very short life time of the possible resonance, whose width is about $\lambda^2 m_\phi / 16\pi$, i.e. ~ 6.3 MeV. The peak is caused by the interference between the real part of the resonance with the SM amplitude at close to the resonance ($m_\phi^2 \pm \Gamma m_\phi$) and at the resonance by the imaginary part of the resonance amplitude. The height of the peak depends on how we divide the integration regions. The peak is a prominent feature for s-channel new particle production model. For easy comparison with experimental data, the effect of the leptoquark production is plotted in a histogram instead of the peak in Fig.3. It is an effect averaged over the whole bin from 0.4 to 0.5 in which data provide a reasonable statistical significance as described below.

The contact interaction model also has very distinctive feature from the PDF modification model. The distributions for both solutions **A** and **B** mentioned previously rise considerably at large x . This is a clear signature for contact interaction.

In Fig.3, we also present our analysis of the available data. With H1's 14 pb⁻¹ and ZEUS's 20 pb⁻¹ data [1], we have 443 events with $Q^2 > 2500 \text{ GeV}^2$ and 191 events with $Q^2 > 5000 \text{ GeV}^2$. The point indicated by an open circle is obtained using H1 data only ($x < 0.4$) because ZEUS data are not available in large ψ region. Above 0.4, data from both groups are used which are indicated by filled circles. The luminosity normalization is entirely canceled since the ratio, R_ψ , is taken. At large x , the bin size on x axis is taken quite big because of the poor statistics. We also carried out an exercise assuming that data points in large ψ and low x region for ZEUS, where the data are not available, is similar to H1 data. The total event number in this region is then assumed to be $(1 + L_{ZEUS}/L_{H1})$ times H1 event number. Here L means luminosity. Now, there are much more data in the region with $x < 0.4$, we divide this region into two bins. These points are indicated by squares in Fig. 3. The experimental results are drawn on top of the theoretical predictions. Because of the big error bars associated with the data points, it is hard to say which model is ruled out. The combined data points seem to favor the leptoquark production explanation. However, we must keep in mind that the two points indicated by squares are not directly obtained from experimental data. The assumption we made may not be valid. We suggest our experimental colleagues to carry out a thorough analysis.

Before concluding our paper, we would like to comment on several other tests for different models. If the anomaly in $e^+p \rightarrow e^+X$ is indeed due to modification of the PDF's, there should be anomaly in $e^-p \rightarrow e^-X$ also because the cross section in these two modes are scaled approximately by the same amount. It will be tested once more data are available. If the modification of the PDF is on the u-quark PDF, similar enhancement will show up in $e^-p \rightarrow \nu X$, whereas if the modification is on d-quark PDF, a large enhancement will show up in $e^+p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}X$ which is in conflict with the data already [9,10].

The particular scalar s-channel production model discussed before will only have anomaly in $e^+p \rightarrow e^+X$ [5]. Whereas for contact interaction model, it is possible to have either result. Due to the particular chiral structure of solution **A**, $e^-p \rightarrow e^-X$ is suppressed by a factor of $(1 - y)^2$ and has little effect on the SM cross section. However, solution **B** will have

enhanced $e^-p \rightarrow e^-X$ due to large η_{RR}^{eu} . In order to distinguish these models from the PDF modification model, one needs to study the $R_\psi(x)$ distribution discussed before.

The predictions for charged current for s-channel resonance and contact interaction models are very model dependent [11]. It is difficult to draw generic conclusions without specific model which we will not attempt in this paper.

To conclude, we have introduced a new method to distinguish models for the high- Q^2 $e^+p \rightarrow e^+X$ anomaly at HERA. For concreteness, three representative models have been considered. Using this new method it is possible to distinguish different models with increased luminosity. It is clear that the same analysis can be used to distinguish other models. Also the same analysis can be used for $e^-p \rightarrow e^-X$, $e^- \rightarrow \nu X$ and $e^+p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}X$. We urge our experimental colleagues to carry out such analyses.

This work was supported in part by the US Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG03-96ER40972 and the Australian Research Council.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Adloff et al., H1 collaboration, DESY preprint 97-24, hep-ex/9702012; J. Breitweg et al., ZEUS collaboration, DESY preprint 97-25, hep-ex/9702015.
- [2] S. Kuhlmann, H.L. Lai, W.K. Tung, hep-ph/9704338.
- [3] J.F. Gunion, R. Vogt, hep-ph/9706252; S. Rock, P. Bosted, hep-ph/9706436;
- [4] T. D. Choudhury and S. Raychaudhuri, hep-ph/9702392; H. Dreiner and P. Morawitz, hep-ph/9703279; J. Kalinowski et al., hep-ph/9703288; J. Hewett and T. Rizzo, hep-ph/9703337; M. C. Gozales-Garcia and M. Fabbrichesi, hep-ph/9703346; N. Di Bartolomeo and M. Fabbrichesi, hep-ph/9703375; A. Nelson, hep-ph/9703379; B.A.Arbuzov, hep-ph/9703460; T. Kon and T. Kobayashi, hep-ph/9704221; R. Barbieri, Z. Berezhiani and A. Strumia, hep-ph/9704275; W. Buchmuller and D. Wyler, hep-ph/9704317; K. Akama, K. Katsura and H. Terazawa, hep-ph/9704327; S.F. King and G.K. Leontaris, hep-ph/9704336; Godfrey, hep-ph/9704380; B. Dutta, R. Mohapatra, S. Nandi, hep-ph/9704428; D.P. Roy, hep-ph/9705370; S. Jadach, W. Placzek, B.F.L. Ward, hep-ph/9705395; J. Ellis, S. Lola, K. Sridhar, hep-ph/9705416; F. Caravaglios, hep-ph/9706288; L. Giusti, A. Strumia, hep-ph/9706298; Jihn E. Kim, P. Ko, hep-ph/9706387; A.S. Joshipura, V. Ravindran, S.K. Vempati, hep-ph/9706482; S. Lola, hep-ph/9706519.
- [5] K.S. Babu, C. Kolda, J. March-Russell and F. Wilczek, hep-ph/9703299.
- [6] G. Altarelli, J. Ellis, G. Giudice, S. Lola and M. Mangano, hep-ph/9703276.
- [7] V. Barger, K. Cheung, K. Hagiwara and D. Zeppenfeld, hep-ph/9703311.
- [8] N.G. Deshpande, B. Dutta and X.-G. He, hep-ph/9705236.
- [9] D.Krakauer, talk given at Stony Brook, NY, June 10,1997, (in ZEUS's web home page: <http://www.zeus.desy.de>).

- [10] K.S. Babu, C. Kolda and J. March-Russell, hep-ph/9705399.
- [11] G. Altarelli, G.F. Giudice and M.L. Mangano, hep-ph/9705287; K.S. Babu, C. Kolda and J. March-Russell, hep-ph/9705414.

FIGURES

FIG. 1. The integrated cross section of $e^+p \rightarrow e^+X$ for different models. Experimental data are taken from Ref.[1]. The CTEQ4M PDF's are used as the conventional ones.

FIG. 2. The differential cross section of SM and sum of parton distribution at given x versus ψ . For easy comparison with each other, the results for $x=0.5$ and 0.7 are multiplied by a factor of 10 and 100 respectively.

FIG. 3. The ratio R_ψ versus x for different models. Data are taken from Ref.[1]. A sharp peak for the leptoquark production is marked by the arrow. The leptoquark contribution to the whole bin from 0.4 to 0.5 is represented by the histogram and the rest of the ratio is exactly the same as the SM prediction.





